UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,446	04/12/2006	Hideki Takamatsu	127709	2085
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 10/14/200 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	350	BEAULIEU, YONEL		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3661	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/575,446	TAKAMATSU ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	/Yonel Beaulieu/	3661			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	-· action is non-final.				
·=	/ 				
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
ologod in accordance markine practice ander 2	parte quayre, 1000 0.2. 11, 10				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4,11-16,23 and 24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 5-10 and 17-22 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2006 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)					

Art Unit: 3661

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 - 4, 11 – 16, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 6128564 to Graf.

Regarding the above claims, Graf teaches a driving system control in a vehicle integrated control system including an actuator (6) for driver's request in operating a driving source and a transmission mechanism of the vehicle – the vehicle having an engine and a driving motor (not explicitly shown but inherently present), the system comprising an output calculation unit (27) [note col. 9, lines 38 – 41; col. 10, lines 6 – 10 and col. 11, lines 25 – 30]; a target gear ratio determination unit calculating a target gear ratio in the transmission mechanism (col. 7, lines 10 – 27; col. 8,lines 10 – 21 at least); a transmission control unit (inherently present) to control the transmission mechanism; a generated torque calculation unit calculating driving torque generated in the vehicle (known feature driving system control in a vehicle as noted in col. 1, lines 35 – 50 at least), but fails to explicitly operation performance in an upper hierarchy and a lower hierarchy and manipulation of two differing amounts.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention Graf's teaching is at least fully functionally equivalent to the claimed system because Graf has been shown to teach, at block 1 in figure 1 at least, items 27 and 28 that would support an upper and a lower hierarchy as claimed, wherein the first decision differs from the second decision.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5 – 10 and 17 - 22 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

While Graf has been shown to teach engine torque model (fig. 3), the prior art is silent on performing inverse operation of torque using a torque converter inverse model which compensates response with respect to a motive power transfer system that is represented by first-order lag and dead time, an output calculation request taking into account of an influence of disturbance due to an auxiliary device of the vehicle that is a load of a driving source.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. As per attached PTO-892.

Application/Control Number: 10/575,446 Page 4

Art Unit: 3661

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to /Yonel Beaulieu/ whose telephone number is (571) 272-6955. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon., Wed. & Thur. between 0900 and 1600.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas BLACK can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yonel Beaulieu/ Yonel Beaulieu Primary Examiner Art Unit 3661 Application/Control Number: 10/575,446

Page 5

Art Unit: 3661